

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-25 are rejected over prior art. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the remarks below.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kliman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,262,550). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Kliman et al. teaches all the features recited in independent claims 1, 9, 18, 23, and 25. For support, the Examiner cites column 5, lines 55-67, column 6, lines 26-67, and column 7, lines 1-64 of Kliman et al. Applicants disagree.

For brevity, because independent claims 1, 9, 18, 23, and 25 recite similar features, all the independent claims will be collectively discussed using claim 1 as the representative claim.

Without acquiescing to the Examiner's other rejection reasons, the Examiner alleges that Kliman et al. at column 5, lines 45-58, teaches "a removable data storage device for storing data relating to the monitored operating conditions, the removable storage device being co-located with the motor." (Emphasis added.) As can be seen from the quoted sentence, present claim 1 recites a removable data storage device co-located with a motor. Kliman et al. teaches that mass storage devices are part of a conventional computer 15. There is no suggestion or teaching that the mass storages are removable from the computer 15, let alone, removable from the monitoring area.

Column 6, lines 19-24, of Kliman et al. teaches that the motor unit 12 (i.e., computer 15) acquires data signals from the stimulus and measurement instrumentation unit 22, which in turn captures signals from the sensors. See also FIG. 1 of Kliman et al. Although Kliman et al. does not specifically teach how the signals are "captured" by the motor unit 12, in view of FIG. 1, it must be assumed that the signals are captured via hardwire or wirelessly. As disclosed in the present application on pages 1 and 2, paragraph [0003], wireless systems

may cause radio interference, which may cause safety issues, and hardwiring communication cable throughout a power nuclear plant may require plant modification that makes hardwiring cost prohibitive. Applicants submit that Kliman et al. teaches nothing more than the background art disclosed in the present application.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants submit that claims 1, 9, 18, 23, and 25 are patentable over Kliman et al. Dependent claims 2-7, 10-13 and 15-17, 19-22, and 24-25 are also patentable for respectively depending on an allowable base claim.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kliman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,262,550). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As remarked above, independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Kliman et al. Accordingly, dependent claims 8 and 14 are also patentable for respectively depending on an allowable base claim.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-25 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By   
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/LYP/cm